

Remarks

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 were pending in the above-identified application when last examined. Claims 2-5 and 7-9 are amended. Claim 1 is canceled. A new claim 10 is added. Claims 2-5 and 7-10 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boscha (US 2002/0136504). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is canceled rendering moot its rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. V. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim 2 is amended to include the limitation that the plurality of alignment features, the plurality of sleeves and the plurality of ferrules are arranged on the surface of package in an array. Claim 2 is also amended to include the limitation that the fiber optic connector 307 is only secured to the sleeve 308 by the physical contact made by the outer diameter of the ceramic ferrule 310 to the inner diameter of the sleeve 308.

Figure 22a illustrates that alignment posts 304 can be aligned and attached, individually or as a group, to form an array on OECE 302. Alignment posts 304 are small enough so they fit on the front window of OECE 302 in an array. On the other hand, Figure 22B illustrates that ports 224 cannot be aligned and attached to form an array on OECE 302 without increasing the spacing and therefore the size of the OECE 302. Increasing the size of the OECE 302 also increases the cost of the optical assemblies. Therefore, forming an array on OECE reduces the cost of a group of optical assemblies.

In the present case, not every feature of claim 2 is represented in the Boscha reference. Applicants respectfully submit that Boscha does not disclose that the plurality of alignment features, the plurality of sleeves and the plurality of ferrules are arranged on the surface of package in an array. Boscha teaches a group of ferruels, 127a, 126b, 126c and 126d, that form a perimeter of optical assemblies (Figure 6). However, Boscha does not teach an array as shown in Figure 22A of the application.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Boscha does not disclose the limitation that the fiber optic connector 307 is only secured to the sleeve 308 by the physical contact made by the outer diameter of the ceramic ferrule 310 to the inner diameter of the sleeve 308. Boscha teaches that a rubber sleeve 23b is secured to a glue layer 23c in order to secure the optical fiber to the ferrule (pg. 3, paragraph [0023]).

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Boscha does not anticipate Applicants' claim 2. Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Regarding claims 3 and 5, dependent claims 3 and 5 further define patentably distinct independent claim 2. Therefore, dependent claims 3 and 5 are also believed to be allowable. For at least the above reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boscha in view of Gilliland et al. (US 6,416,238 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Dependent claim 4 further defines patentably distinct independent claim 2. Therefore, dependent claim 4 is also believed to be allowable. For at least the above reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boscha in view of Freeman (US 5,195,156). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Dependent claims 7-9 further define patentably distinct independent claim 2. Therefore, dependent claims 7-9 are also believed to be allowable. For at least the above reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' pending claims (2-5 and 7-10) are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

March 12, 2010

/John Pessetto/

John R. Pessetto, Reg. No. 48,369
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225
Denver, Colorado 80202
Tel. (303) 298-9888
Fax (303) 297-2266